DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 533 UD 028 292

AUTHOR Pavan, Barbara Nelson; Reid, Nancy Andrade
TITLE Espoused Theoretical Frameworks and the Leadership Behaviors of Principals in Achieving Urban Elementary Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Administrative Principles; Behavior Patterns; Elementary Education; *Elementary Schools; Elementary School Teachers; *Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Styles; Politics of Education; *Principals; School Supervision; Theory Practice Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

The dominant theoretical frameworks (structural, human resources, political, or cultural) espoused by elementary school principals are studied; and the platforms are compared with data previously collected on leadership behaviors and time usage. Data for 5 principals and 151 teachers in 5 elementary schools in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) on the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) are presented. The PIMRS is used to determine the teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional management behaviors and perceptions of the principals. Data for principals on time use surveys are included. The elementary schools have student enrollments of between 382 and 816 students with minority populations from 16 percent to 100 percent. The espoused theoretical framework is determined using the principals' responses to the Leadership Orientations Instrument. The results show that one principal uses a structural frame, three principals use a human resources frame, and one principal uses a combination of structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames. The principal who espoused the greatest number of theoretical frames has the most relevant and recent training. All the principals have internalized the norm of high expectations for students and teachers, and use this concept to drive their own leadership behaviors, as indicated by the teachers. In these urban schools, use of the political frame is surprisingly low. Five tables of statistical data and a 13-item list of references are included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337533

Espoused Theoretical Frameworks and The Leadership Behaviors of Principals in Achieving Urban Elementary Schools

Dr. Barbara Nelson Pavan
Professor of Educational Administration
Temple University 003-00
Philadelphia, PA 19122
(215) 787-6167

Dr. Nancy Andrade Reid
District 4 Superintendent
Philadelphia School District
Philadelphia, PA 19132

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Chicago, Illinois
April 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

BN Pavan
Temple U

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD #028 292

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Espoused Theoretical Frameworks and The Leadership Behaviors of Principals in Achieving Urban Elementary Schools

BARBARA NELSON PAVAN
Temple University

NANCY ANDRADE REID
Philadelphia School District

Objective

Studies of principal effectiveness have centered on the characteristics, roles, tasks, and daily work behaviors of principals in effective schools. The espoused theoretical frameworks held by these principals have received little attention in the research. This study determined if structural, human resources, political or cultural frames were the dominant frames used by the principals. The espoused platform was then compared to the previous data collected on leadership behaviors and time usage.

Perspective

Edmonds (1979) concluded that effective schools have the following characteristics: (1) a strong principal, (2) high expectations for students and teachers, (3) orderly but not rigid atmosphere, (4) emphasis on instruction, and (5) student progress monitoring system. More recently Smith and Andrews (1989) and Pavan and Reid (1989) have provided more detailed accounts of effective principals and their behaviors. The school improvement/effective schools research was summarized by Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1984) to suggest options for practice. Firestone and Wilson (1985) concluded that principals should avail themselves of opportunities to shape both bureaucratic and cultural linkages within the schools.

Purkey and Smith (1983) identify four process variables which sustain a productive school culture: (1) collaborative planning and collegial relationships; (2) building a sense of community through appropriate use of ceremony, symbols and rules; (3) sharing clear goals and high expectations; and (4) maintaining order and discipline. Deal (1985) compared the characteristics of effective schools and strong organizational cultures, then concluded with the need for each school to strengthen its own culture.

Bolman and Deal (1984) suggest that the perspective or theory which is used to view the world influences what we see and what we do. They indicate that managers should not use one, but many frames to view organizational life. Their view is that different frames will illuminate different situations. The four theoretical frameworks except the last mirror management/organizational theory as generally understood: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. The structural perspective relies on formal rules and relationships viewed in a rational manner with clear goals and defined work flow. The human resource person tries to fit the organization to serve the individual's needs. The political approach involves developing coalitions in order to allocate resources and results in conflict, bargaining, and negotiation. The symbolic approach stresses the meaning of events and uses rituals, ceremonies, and symbols to build a shared organizational culture. The Leadership Orientation(s) Instrument (Bolman and Deal, 1990) has been developed to determine the dominant frame (s) used by a leader.

Methods, Data Sources

The sample population for this study consisted of five principals and 151 (97%) teachers in five elementary schools in the School District of Philadelphia which are involved in a school improvement project. The principals had served a minimum of two years in their current schools. The schools had demonstrated improvement according to an effectiveness formula (Vincenzi and Ayrer, 1985), which measured both student achievement and socioeconomic status.

The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) developed by Hallinger (1983) was used to determine both the teachers' perceptions of their principal's instructional management behaviors and that of the principals. The National Task-Time Survey (Howell, 1980), was completed by each principal during one week to indicate usage of time. Interviews were conducted with each principal with a major focus on determining the principal's efforts to build a school culture. Analysis of this data and the interviews was used to develop individual school portraits.

A chart was then developed using Purkey and Smith's (1985) four school culture concepts (collaboration, community, expectations, and order) showing under each concept, the specific behaviors exhibited by each principal. The variations among the principals was striking just in terms of the numbers of behaviors in each category.

The espoused theoretical framework was determined through the principals' responses to the Leadership Orientations Instrument developed by Bolman and Deal (1990). Principals responded to 32 items which were then submitted to statistical analysis to determine the dominant frame and

strength of other frames espoused by each principal. Each frame consists of two separate dimensions of leadership which are listed below:

1. Human Resources Dimensions

    a. Supportive -- concerned about the feelings of others; supportive and responsive

    b. Participative -- fosters participation and involvement; listens and is open to new ideas

2. Structural Dimensions

    a. Analytic -- thinks clearly and logically; approaches problems with facts and attends to detail

    b. Organized -- develops clear goals and policies; hold people accountable for results

3. Political Dimensions

    a. Powerful -- persuasive, high level of ability to mobilize people and resources; effective at building alliances and support

    b. Adroit -- political sensitive and skillful; a skillful negotiator in face of conflict and opposition

4. Symbolic Dimensions

    a. Inspirational -- inspires others to loyalty and enthusiasm; communicates a strong sense of vision

    b. Charismatic -- imaginative, emphasizes culture and values; is highly charismatic

(Bolman and Deal, 1990: 6,7)

Results

The five elementary schools which were located in different neighborhoods, had student enrollments of 382 to 816 with minority populations from 16% to 100%. Socioeconomic status ranged from a school which has 45 percent of its families receiving aid to dependent children

(AFDC) to a school where 76 percent of the families received aid. National percentile ranks in reading on the City-Wide Tests ranged from the 30th to 50th percentile in reading and from the 45th to 70th percentile in math.

Four of the five principals are female; three are white, two are black. The length of time in education ranged between 22 and 42 years, while the length of time in the principalship ranged from 4 to 15 years. Two principals have plans which included promotional activities; two are considering retirement in the next few years.

The Principals' Workday

Table 1 shows the summary of how the five principals utilized their time during a one-week period. Principals were asked to indicate on the Howell National Task-Time Survey (1980) the activity utilizing the greatest amount of time during each 30 minute interval. In a few cases, particularly before 8:30 a.m., principals indicated two activities during the interval, such as "office communications" and "building maintenance".

The five principals indicated that they spent the greatest amount of time on the Faculty Relations category (average of 16 hours per principal per week). Principals devoted the most time to classroom supervision (5 1/2 hours). Two principals spent approximately eight hours during the week conducting and summarizing observations, while the other three devoted an average of 3 1/2 hours to this activity. Principals engaged in discussions with their staff members on the average of 4 1/4 hours per week; the range was between 2 1/2 and 6 1/2 hours per week. Although the NTTS classified "informal visits" under the Student Relations

category, this activity may also be viewed as a Faculty Relations activity. Principals indicated that they spent an average of 4 1/4 hours per week on this activity. One principal did not make any informal visits.

An average of four hours was devoted to district meetings during the week. Each sub-district in the School District of Philadelphia holds biweekly principal meetings on Fridays. The principals also devoted an average of four hours during the week to office communications. This activity occurred before 8:30 a.m. and after 3:30 p.m.

Principals devoted the least amount of time (average of 1 1/4 hours per week) to the Community Relations category. However, they did spend an average of three hours in parent conferences. Principals spent little or no time on the following activities: civic organizations, media relations, scheduled teaching, testing/evaluation, athletics, programs/plays, planning self-improvement, and reading/coursework.

Smith and Andrews (1989) calculated time spent by Washington State elementary principals considered as strong instructional leaders in four categories. When the data for this study were re-assigned to their categories, the percentages were nearly identical.

	Washington State	Philadelphia
Educational Program	49%	43%
School-community relations	8%	9%
Student services	20%	25%
Building, district activities	23%	23%

Instructional Leadership Behaviors

Teachers and principals indicated their perceptions of the frequencies of exhibited principal behaviors as described in the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (Hallinger 1983). Frequencies are indicated on a Likert-type scale with a range from (1) almost never to (5) almost always. Table 2 shows the means and the rankings for the principal ratings by the teachers and the principals on the eleven subscales.

Teachers ranked Supervision and Evaluating Instruction as the highest subscale. This subscale was ranked third by the principals. The teachers gave the highest rating to the item in this subscale which dealt with conducting formal and informal observations. Principals gave the highest ranking to the Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards subscale. There is a large discrepancy between their ranking and that of the teachers who ranked this subscale as seventh. The greatest difference between the two groups in the items in this subscale is the one which indicates support for teachers when they enforce academic policies.

Both teachers and principals ranked Framing the School Goals as the second highest subscale. They were also in agreement in the Promoting Professional Development and Providing Incentives for Teachers, which they ranked eighth and ninth, respectively. The subscales Maintaining High Visibility and Protecting Instructional Time were ranked as the two lowest by both teachers and principals. Among the High Visibility items, both groups agreed that principals did not cover classes or provide direct instruction as frequently as they performed other behaviors. In the Protecting Instructional Time subscale, the items dealing with ensuring consequences for tardy and truant students and ensuring that students are

not called to the office received low ratings from the teachers and the principals.

Table 3 shows the means for the principal ratings by the teachers and the principals on each of the sixty-three items in the PIMRS across the schools. Principals indicated their most frequently utilized instructional leadership behaviors in the following order: develop annual goals, relate goals to academic improvement, support teacher enforcement of academic policies, recognize superior students, and assess overlap of curriculum and tests. While these behaviors relate to academic concerns, the next three indicate principal interactions: visit classes to speak with teachers and staff, point out teacher strengths, and privately reinforce good teaching. The least utilized behaviors required intensive time commitment by principals to work with problem students, to cover classes, and to demonstrate instruction. Even though these principals did privately speak to teachers about good teaching, they did not write this up for their personnel files.

Principal and School Portraits

Mr. Jones, the Planner/Organizer has served in the principalship for fifteen years, the last five at the Adams School. He has been in education for twenty-six years and was the only principal to move directly from classroom teaching to the principalship. Mr. Jones received the highest teacher rating among the five principals on each of the eleven subscales and on fifty-seven of the sixty-three individual items of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. He rated himself lower than his teachers did on all items. He devoted the most time to the

Student Relations Category on the National Task Time Survey, and spent the most hours during the week on the supervision of students' activities.

The Adams school is a large elementary school of about 600 students with an 85% white student body and 50% of the families on Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC). The students scored above the 30th percentile in reading and between the 30th and 80th percentile in mathematics on the City-Wide Tests. The school had a previous reputation of having tough students who went to a local junior high and then dropped out of school.

The school culture which Mr. Jones has built is one which communicates the importance of getting a good education and encouraging staff members to grow. In the words of Mr. Jones, "I figure that what people look at to determine whether or not I am a successful principal is how well children do academically." He is very supportive of the teachers and goes "out of his way" to thank the entire staff and/or individual teachers, personally or in writing, when they are doing a good job. He encourages the teachers to return to school to get advanced degrees. The majority have not because of family responsibilities. Five teachers have become administrators or supervisors.

Mr. Jones is a very straightforward, no-nonsense person. He was the only principal to mention that his initial goal for the school was to provide a safe and clean environment in which learning could take place. He also wanted to make sure that the teachers had the necessary materials and supplies to do their jobs. When developing the school goals, he selected seven of the best teachers and "bounced ideas off of them."

During the first year of his tenure at the school, he established and enforced promotion standards prior to the systemwide promotion policy.

Mr. Jones describes himself as a good organizer and planner. Once the school improvement committees have developed the school plan, he arranges the staff development calendar and contacts the presenters. He monitors student progress through reading and math student achievement charts in his office and by reviewing the teachers' grade books when he visits classes. He does not believe in creating extra paperwork for his teachers. In order to complete his formal observations of the teachers, he schedules his observations in the early part of each semester.

Mr. Jones is a very visible principal. He tries to visit each class every day. He states, "I'm like chickenman; I'm everywhere and they never know when they are going to see me."

Ms. Turner, the Instructional Supervisor, has been the principal at the Banneker School for the past five years, after previously serving for five years at another school. She is the only principal who majored in elementary education and has earned a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies. She plans to retire in a few years. She received middle range ratings from her teachers on the PIMRS. She rated herself higher than the teachers did on one-half of the subscales. Ms. Turner devoted the greatest amount of time to the Faculty Relations category on the NTTS, and spent the most hours on the classroom supervision activity.

Over 800 students are enrolled at the Banneker School; 96% are black and 45% of the families are classified as needing AFDC. The City-Wide Test Scores in reading are inconsistent across grade levels, ranging from

the 27th to 72nd percentile. Mathematics scores are higher, ranging from the 45th to 79th percentile.

Ms. Turner is in the process of building a school culture which is tailored to the needs of students, staff, parents, and community members. She explains:

> We have a lot of single parents in the community. We have a lot of parents who love their children and would like for them to do certain things such as being consistent with homework but don't know how to approach it. So we say we have to tailor what happens in this school by the community, not to lower the expectations, but certainly to recognize that there are certain needs here that may not be in existence in other schools.

In the past, school problems have resulted in confrontations between teachers, parents, and politicians. The present school culture is not characterized by a strong sense of collegiality as there has not been a bonding of old and new staff members.

Ms. Turner describes her leadership role as that of an instructional supervisor. "I'd rather do staff development than have someone else do it for me because a lot of times I find that people don't do it the way I want them to do it". She tries to keep an open-door policy to facilitate teachers coming to her with classroom and/or instructional problems. She coordinates the curriculum by breaking the Instructional Planning Guide into grade level units. When reviewing lesson plans, Ms. Turner includes a "comments" sheet where she writes notes and reminders and sometimes requests that lesson plans be redone. She utilizes grade group discussion meetings on student performance as a means of applying subtle pressure on teachers to improve the pacing of instruction.

Ms. Moore, the Learner, has the least experience as a principal with only three and a half years as principal of the Carter School. She is

currently planning on pursuing doctoral studies and has career plans which include promotional opportunities. She received fairly high teacher ratings on six of the eleven subscale in the PIMRS. She rated herself lower than her teachers did on one-half of the subscales. Ms. Moore devoted most of her time to the Student Relations category on the NTTS, and spent the greatest amount of time on the parent conference activity.

The Carter School with over 400 students from kindergarten to eighth grade, all of whom are black, has 57% of their families on AFDC. On the City-Wide Test, two grade levels scored below the 30th percentile on reading and the range in mathematics was between the 30th and the 65th percentile.

It has been difficult for Ms. Moore to build a strong school culture due to several changes at her school. She was appointed to the school as a new principal in 1985. Approximately one half of the staff are either newly appointed teachers or teachers who are new to the building. In addition, the school is in the process of converting from an elementary to a middle school. Regarding her vision of the middle school culture she would like to create, Ms. Moore states:

> I would like the middle school to be an intimate one where students and staff really know each other. I would like to give the students an opportunity to explore various avenues of interest, whether they be career-related or interest-related. To really spark their curiosity and motivation, we plan to have a number of mini-courses and to employ community resources in terms of exposure to careers, especially for the males in our school.

Ms. Moore approaches her job as a learner who accomplishes what she sets out to do. In her words, "I guess I'm like the kids - growing stronger every day." She believes that she gets along well with a wide range of personalities and can tactfully make remarks which are well

received. She states that her accomplishments can be attributed to an underlying belief that if she can "think" things, they can be done. In addition, she continually analyzes her limitations and attempts to make each succeeding year a better one.

The implementation of the effective schools philosophy is Ms. Moore's major thrust. She tries to convey the concept that all children can learn. Emphasis is placed on a highly visible student recognition program. Because of the small size of the school, decisions are often made by consensus in whole group interactive faculty meetings. Tasks are completed by ad hoc committees and a group of teachers who are good workers.

The People/School Welfare Principal, Ms. Williams, has been principal of the Dover School for the past ten years. She has been an educator for forty-two years and had been in the principalship for twelve years prior to her appointment at Dover. She received the lowest teacher rating among the five principals on each of the eleven subscales and on fifty-nine of the sixty-three items on the PIMRS. In many cases, she received essentially bimodal response distributions on the items. Ms. Williams rated herself higher than her teachers did on the majority of items. She devoted the most time to the Faculty Relations category on the NTTS and spent the most time on the classroom supervision activity. She did not spend any time on one-half of the thirty-three activities, including informal visits.

The Dover School has a student enrollment approaching 400, nearly two thirds Hispanic and the rest black. Approximately three quarters of the families receive AFDC. Mathematics scores range from the 22nd to the

60th percentile and two-thirds of the students scored below the 30th percentile in reading.

Ms. Williams is attempting to build a school culture which is open to people and new ideas. The school has a yearly slogan and several ethnic celebrations; a student who won a School District contest is the school's hero. The Home and School officers are in the school during the majority of the day. Several creative approaches to instruction and resource allocation are being utilized in order to meet students' needs. Ms. Williams states, "I listen to my teachers. I see the problems they have with specific students."

Ms. Williams approaches her job mostly from an affective domain perspective. She loves her job and wants to make the school the kind of school people would want to come to from across town. Her primary goal is to raise achievement so that the students can get good jobs and compete. She relies on a team approach to accomplish the goals. She states, "I'm comfortable with sharing, with working with a team.... They're not just supporting the kids; they're supporting me." She has established several committees and elaborate communication systems with the faculty.

Dr. Smith, the Reflective Practitioner, has been the principal of The Eastman School for fours years. Prior to becoming a principal, she served in several teacher liaison roles. She has a doctorate in educational administration and is pursuing promotional opportunities. She received very high ratings from her teachers on the PIMRS subscales and agreed with their perceptions on the majority of items. Dr. Smith devoted

the most time to the Faculty Relations category on the NTTS and balanced the remainder of her time among four other categories.

The Eastman School houses a kindergarten through grade eight population of just under 400 students, 20% of whom are special education. The students are mostly black with a small percentage of white and Hispanic students. The AFDC rate is 67%. One-half of the students scored below the 30th percentile in reading; mathematics scores ranged between the 41st and the 81st percentile.

Dr. Smith views the role of a principal as that of a teacher of adults and emphasizes a school culture of a community of learners. She has incorporated all the elements in Deals' (1987) cultural framework in the operation of the school. Shared values are communicated through the slogan, "Be the Best That You Can Be" and through emphasis on the school's history. During the previous year, this school held a fiftieth birthday celebration. The ceremony included the burying of a time capsule which will be opened in the year 2012 and the unveiling of a Wall of History display of pictures and memorabilia of former students and staff members. Heroes include the former principal, the school community coordinator, and the present principal. Stories center on current school improvement efforts and successes of students.

Dr. Smith approaches her instructional leadership responsibilities as a reflective practitioner. When she first arrived at the school, she realized that there was quite a discrepancy between the staff's perception of the school as an excellent school and the reality of student performance with only 12% of the students reading at grade level. She established a leadership team and began to empower teachers. According

to Dr. Smith, "I knew that I couldn't do it alone...as the new kid on the block, I needed help in spreading the message and a way to begin to sow the seeds."

The leadership team consists of Dr. Smith and the chairpersons of content area committees who are generally classroom teachers. In developing the School Improvement Plan, the team has institutionalized the needs assessment process by participating in semi-annual reviews of the school plan. Staff development is an integral part of the plan and is led by teachers in the school. Ms. Smith describes her leadership role as follows:

> If you have a vision of what you want in a school, then it makes me proactive in dealing with all those minute and discrete activities so that they become part of a whole. I tie together in a thoughtful way the things that I do and the structures I create and my everyday behaviors into building that community of learners.

Purkey-Smith Culture Concepts

All five principals expressed goals for their schools which centered on student achievement. In order to accomplish this goal, much of their time was spent supervising and evaluating instruction and otherwise directly interacting with teachers. Students were also the recipients of much of the principals' time in both formal and informal activities. These principals spent almost no time on community relations, instead they focus on the academic program and people within the school setting. Paper work is generally completed either before or after the students' and teachers' official work day. With the exception of the biweekly district principals' meeting, these principals remain in their buildings interacting with students and staff or with parents about their children.

Yet these schools are different and the leadership of the principals differs from each other. Purkey and Smith (1985) have noted that in addition to a set of characteristics of an effective school that can be implemented rather easily by an administrator, there is a second group which they call process variables. These four define the school culture and are necessary to sustain academic improvement.

1. Collaborative planning and collegial relationships in change efforts;
2. Building a sense of community through appropriate usage of ceremony, symbols, and rules;
3. Sharing clear goals and high expectations;
4. Maintaining order and discipline.

In order to examine these five principals within this theoretical framework, Table 4 was constructed grouping their behaviors into the four concepts: collaboration, community, expectations, and order. The variations among the principals are striking just in terms of the numbers of behaviors which fall into each category for each principal. All the principals have internalized the norm of high expectations for both students and teachers and use this concept to drive their own leadership behavior. Based on information received from teachers in the university classes of one author, the emphasis on classroom supervision by these principals is not universal throughout the school district. Rather surprising is the lack of items in the order category with only Mr. Jones stressing the need for a safe, orderly environment. Ms. Williams is the only other principal who schedules herself to oversee the school yard and the lunchroom on a regular basis. Since the other schools generally

appeared orderly, it might be assumed that the other principals had previously attended to this issue which is of paramount importance especially in an urban environment.

While all principals have attempted to involve faculty in planning (and the district has developed a school improvement planning process which requires teacher input), the degree of involvement varies to a great degree. Principals feel that this has been caused by staff turnover, change in the organizational structure or that small groups bonded together. A strong teachers' union has severely limited the number of faculty meetings, yet the principals did not place blame on the contract for the limited collaboration noted in all but the Eastman School. Dr. Smith consciously set out to empower her teachers. She stated, "I knew that I couldn't do it alone [change the school]... as the new kid on the block, I needed help in spreading the message and a way to begin to sow the seeds."

Of all the principals, Dr. Smith is the only one to build community through significant usage of ceremony and symbols. She is also the only principal who appeared to be acquainted with the concept of school culture and culture building. The influence of her doctoral training in educational administration might have led to her greater understanding of culture building and her willingness to empower teachers.

Espoused Theoretical Frameworks

The results on the Leadership Orientations Instrument (Bolman and Deal, 1990) for the five principals as a group and individually are shown

on Table 5. The data already mentioned in this paper had been collected and analyzed before this instrument became available. Usage of the instrument was to provide a validity check on both the previous analysis and the instrument. As had been expected the human resource frame was the main theory espoused by Mrs. Turner, Ms. Williams, and Mrs. Moore and was rated highest by the total group. Also anticipated was that Mr. Jones would indicate the structural framework as his espoused theory. While it had been predicted that Dr. Smith would espouse the symbolic framework to the greatest degree, mention of her recent educational administration doctoral training and the descriptor given to her of Reflective Practitioner; also indicated her wide range of knowledge. Dr. Smith gave equal weight to the human resources, political, and symbolic or cultural framework. Note that she was the only one not to use the highest rating of 5 for herself, so her absolute numbers are lower than the other principals. Four of the principals espouse one theory while one principal gives equal emphasis to three theories.

Most surprising was that the political frame was rated the lowest by the group. These principals work in the Philadelphia school district, one of the largest in the country, and the assumption is generally made that politics are very necessary to big city survival. This is explained in part by looking at the two political dimensions: powerful and adroit. Only Miss Moore and Dr. Smith see themselves as powerful, able to persuade and build alliances. However, Mr. Turner, Ms. Williams, and Dr. Smith rated use of the adroit or shrewd dimension high. This indicates their skillful negotiation tactics in face of conflict and opposition.

Both human resource dimensions, supportative and participative,

along with the inspirational dimension of the symbolic frame were rated very high by the four female principals. Only Dr. Smith rated the charismatic factor of the symbolic frame very high. Only one principal in addition to Mr. Jones used the organizational element of the structural frame, but two in addition to him used the analytic dimension.

Discussion

In order to determine if the principals' espoused theories matched their actual leadership behaviors, their Leadership Orientation Self Ratings were examined along with all other data including personal knowledge with emphasis on the Principal Portraits and Table 4.

Mr. Jones indicated that he used the structural framework which is clear by his descriptor, the Planner/Organizer. He is concerned about a safe, clean environment; he attends to details such arranging the calendar and monitoring student progress with office wall charts; and he established a promotion policy. Mr. Jones analyzes a given problem with input from some selected teachers and then organizes the school based on his analysis.

Mrs. Turner's self rating was of using the human resources framework plus the inspirational dimension. She spent most of her time in faculty relations activities and the most hours in classroom supervision. The school has not yet become strongly collegial in part due to past conflicts between teachers, parents, and politicans. Teachers may perceive some of her efforts more as monitoring than as supportive. Her descriptor, the Instructional Supervisor, came about because she provides all the school staff development and has reorganized the curriculum guide.

Ms. Williams gave herself the highest possible score on the human resource framework, the adroit dimension of the political frame, and the inspirational dimension of the symbolic frame. In general she rated herself higher than any other principal did. Teacher ratings on the PIMRS were the lowest of all the principals and she received bimodal response distribution on many items. Her descriptor, the People/School Welfare Principal, was based on self reports of time spent on faculty relations and classroom supervision. She uses committees and a leadership team but bonding has occurred among groups, not the whole school. In this case especially, ratings by the faculty are needed to determine if the principals' perceptions are accurate. It would appear that the principal's perceptions may not be based on the total faculty but on only one segment. (Note. Due to principal reassignment the teachers could not be surveyed).

While Mrs. Moore believes she relies most strongly on the human resources theoretical frame, she is also strong on one dimension from each of the other frames: She has organized (structural dimension) the schedule so teachers can meet in teams. Even though there has been a high level of staff turnover due to conversion from an elementary to a middle school, she has been an inspiration (symbolic) to many and able to mobilize people and resources (powerful dimension of political frame) during this process. She is open to everyone's ideas and seeks consensus at faculty meetings. The Learner uses the human resources frame most frequently and will probably use even more dimensions of the other frames as she continues to learn.

Dr. Smith did not use the highest rating of 5 for any item on Leadership Orientations Instrument. With this in mind, note that she perceives high or very high usage of each framework and dimension with the exception of organized. Essentially she uses all frames and dimensions but is not yet satisfied with her ability to have everything organized. She received very high teacher ratings on the PIMRS and her perceptions were in general agreement. She was described as the Reflective Practitioner which becomes very apparent with her quote given earlier. Of all the principals she was the only one to use the terminology of the various frames. Since she had recently completed a doctorate in educational administration that was not surprising, but that she actually used all the frames was. She held more ceremonial activities than any other principal. Teachers lead the staff development and the leadership team approach is most pronounced at her school. The school and the faculty have received many grants and the principal is very skilled at obtaining needed resources. Her attention to detail is always in support of her vision for the school.

Implications

The espoused leadership theories of these five principals in achieving urban elementary schools are structural frame, one; human resources, three; and one who uses these two frames plus the political and the symbolic frame. Responses on both the PIMRS by teachers and principals and the NTTS showed that principals devoted the majority of their efforts to faculty relations and classroom supervision. While principals worked with faculty to frame goals, parent and community

involvement was low except as related to individual students. The principals' group average for the political theoretical framework was the lowest, a surprise in a large urban school district. The PIMRS and the NTTS are not developed to indicate behaviors that might be labeled as political and the interviews were designed to probe how the principal developed the school culture. In order to ascertain usage of the political frame, interview questions need to be devised which focus on how the principals influences others and obtains scarce resources.

Of the five principals the one who espoused and utilized the greatest number of theoretical frames was the one with the most relevant and most recent training. The ability to use a number of frames enables one to imagine the greatest number of possibilities or solutions for a given problem. A common error is to fixate on one solution or to seize the first solution which comes to mind. Granted, this is a small sample of only five, but training to understand the four theoretical frames and to practice using them in classroom case situations might help present and prospective school administrators to increase their cognitive flexibility. Bolman and Deal (1984) use this approach in their textbook. Beginning with Fall 1990 a theoretical framework approach utilizing cases was the basis of the organizational theory course in the educational administration doctoral cohort program at Temple University. This course taught by Dr. Barbara Pavan and Dr. Laurence Parker included critical theory as a frame in addition to the structural, human resources, political and symbolic frames of Bolman and Deal (1984). It would appear that this approach does indeed require students both in the classroom and

on the job to analyze a wider range of solutions before devising an action plan.

Early research on effective schools and principals such as Edmonds (1979) focused on lists of factors found in effective schools. A "quick fix" mentality resulted in a recipe-type implementation that looked at the elements as non related. More recent research has focused on the instructional leadership (Smith and Andrews, 1989) aspect of the principal's role and on the school culture (Deal and Peterson, 1990). Both of these books contain case studies and are written to help practicing principals analyze their own behaviors. The study reported here developed principal portraits to also show how the role has to be looked at wholistically not just element by element. Is there a danger that in this approach of building a school culture that the necessity of using and understanding the structural and political frames will be neglected? Will the goal of improved school achievement become buried under the weight of rituals and ceremonies whose point has been forgotten much as the human relations movement led to happy but not fully achieving students? Let us hope not.

References

Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal. Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal. "Images of Leadership." American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA, April, 1990.

Clark, D.L., L.S. Lotto and Terry A. Astuto. "Effective Schools and School Improvement: A Comparative Analysis of Two Lines of Inquiry." Educational Administration Quarterly 20, no. 3 (1984): 41-68.

Deal, Terrence e. "The Symbolism of Effective Schools." Elementary School Journal 85, no. 5 (May 1985): 601-620.

Deal, Terrence E. and Kent D. Peterson. The Principal's Role in Shaping School Culture. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

Edmonds, Ronald. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37, 1 (October 1979): 15-23.

Firestone, William A. and Bruce L. Wilson. "Using Bureaucratic and Cultural Linkages to Improve Instruction: The Principal's Contribution." Educational Administration Quarterly 21, no. 2 (1985): 7-30.

Hallinger, Philip and Joseph F. Murphy. "Assessing and Developing Principal Instructional Leadership." Educational Leadership 45, no. 1 (September 1987): 54-61.

Howell, Bruce. "Profile of the Principalship." Educational Leadership 38, no. 4 (January 1981): 333-336.

Pavan, Barbara N. and Nancy A. Reid. "Building School Cultures in Achieving Urban Elementary Schools: The Leadership Behaviors of Principals." American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA, April, 1990.

Purkey, Stewart C. and Marshall S. Smith. "Effective Schools: A Review." The Elementary School Journal 83, no. 4 (March 1983): 427-452.

Smith, Wilma F. and Richard L. Andrews. Instructional Leadership: How Principals Make a Difference. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1989.

Vincenzi, Harry and James G. Ayrers. "Determining Effective Schools." Urban Education 20, no. 2 (July 1985): 123-132.

TABLE 1

National Task-Time Survey - Principals' Weekly Utilization of Time

Task Category Average Hours	Activity	Range of Hours Across Principals	Average Hours Per Principal	Time of Day
Office Responsibilities 6 1/2 Hours	Office Communications	2 1/2 - 6	4	Before 8:30 a.m. After 3:30 p.m.
	Building Maintenance	0 - 5	2	Before 8:00-8:30 a.m.
	Budget Finance	0 - 1	1/4	--
	Fed./State/Local Forms	0 - 1	1/4	--
Faculty Relations 16 Hours	Supervision - Classroom	3 1/2 - 8 1/2	5 1/2	10 a.m. - 12 p.m.
	Discussions	2 1/2 - 6 1/2	4 1/4	8-9 a.m.;3-4 p.m.
	Faculty Dept. Mtg.	1 - 7	3	Tues., 2-3:00 p.m.
	Teacher Evaluations	0 - 2	1/2	--
	Staff Development	0 - 3	1 1/2	--
	Grievances	0 - 2	1 1/4	--
Community Relations 1 1/4 Hours	Civic Organizations	0 - 1/2	0	--
	Media	0	0	--
	Discussion	0 - 1	1/4	--
	PTA - Parent Groups	0 - 2 1/2	1	--
Personal/ Professional Development 5 Hours	Conference	0 - 4	1	--
	District Meetings	0 - 7 1/2	4	Friday a.m., biweekly
	Planning Self-Improvement	0	0	--
		0	0	--
	Reading Coursework	0	0	--
Student Relations 10 Hours	Discipline	0 - 2 1/2	1 1/4	--
	Parent Conferences	1 1/2 - 5 1/2	3	Throughout the day
	Informal Visits	0 - 10	4 1/2	Throughout the day
	Counseling	1 - 3 1/2	1 1/4	--
	Scheduling Teaching	0 - 1/2	0	--
Curriculum Leadership 2 1/2 Hours	Scheduling	0 - 1 1/2	1/4	--
	Planning	0 - 3	1/2	--
	Demonstration Teaching	0 - 1	1/4	--
	Selecting Materials	0 - 1	1/2	--
	Testing/Evaluation	0 - 1/2	0	--
	Lesson Plans/ Curriculum Guides	0 - 1 1/2	1	Fridays, after 3 p.m.
Extra-Curricular Supervision 4 1/2 Hours	Athletics	0	0	--
	Programs, Plays	0	0	--
	Field Trips	0 - 5	1	--
	Supervision - Lunch, Yard, Bus	0 - 8 1/2	3 1/2	12:00 - 1:30 p.m.

TABLE 2

Instructional Leadership Ratings of Principals' Subscales Across Schools on the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale

Subscale	Teacher Rating n = 151		Principal Self Report n = 5	
	$\bar{X}$	Rank	$\bar{X}$	Rank
Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	4.316	1	4.267	3
Framing the School Goals	4.295	2	4.371	2
Coordinating the Curriculum	4.163	3	4.250	4
Communicating the School Goals	4.155	4	4.200	6
Monitoring Student Progress	4.134	5	4.057	7
Providing Incentives for Learning	4.129	6	4.240	5
Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards	4.083	7	4.550	1
Promoting Professional Development	3.952	8	3.943	8
Providing Incentives for Teachers	3.847	9	3.900	9
Protecting Instructional Time	3.538	10	3.520	11
Maintaining High Visibility	3.475	11	3.680	10

TABLE 3

Instructional Leadership Behavior Ratings of Principals
Individual Items (Across Schools) on the Principal
Instructional Management Rating Scale

Subscale	Item	Behavior	Teacher Rating n = 151 $\bar{X}$	Principal Self Report n = 5 $\bar{X}$
Framing the School Goals	1	Develops annual goals	4.445	5.000
	2	Goals seek improvement	4.410	4.800
	3	Sets target dates for goals	4.299	4.200
	4	Sets staff responsibilities for goals	4.255	3.800
	5	Obtains staff input on goals	4.085	4.440
	6	Uses student data to set goals	4.376	4.440
	7	Goals are easily translated to classroom objectives	3.877	4.440
Communicating the School Goals	8	Communicates goals to people at school	4.200	4.440
	9	Communicates goals in informal settings	4.153	4.440
	10	Communicates goals at faculty meetings	4.345	4.200
	11	Refers to goals in making curricular decisions	4.252	4.440
	12	Goals are reflected in visible displays	4.063	4.000
	13	Refers to goals in assemblies	3.652	3.800
Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	14	Conducts formal and informal observations	4.441	4.200
	15	Ensures that classroom objectives are consistent with goals	4.273	4.200
	16	Reviews student work products	4.211	4.440
	17	Points out teacher strengths	4.336	4.600
	18	Points out teacher weaknesses	4.329	4.440
	19	Notes time on task	4.196	3.800
Coordinating the Curriculum	20	Makes clear who is reponsible for curricular coordination	4.091	4.000
	21	Ensures there are common curricular objectives	4.097	4.440
	22	Uses test results in making curricular decisions	4.312	4.200
	23	Ensures that regular and special program objectives are consistent	3.891	4.000
	24	Monitors classroom curriculum	4.275	4.200
	25	Assesses overlap between curricular objectives and tests	4.122	4.750
	26	Reviews and selects instructional materials	4.063	4.200
Monitoring Student Progress	27	Meets individually with teachers to discuss student progress	4.128	4.200
	28	Discusses item analysis	4.158	4.200
	29	Uses test results to assess progress	4.326	4.440
	30	Distributes test results in timely fashion	4.271	4.200
	31	Informs staff of test results in writing	4.129	3.800
	32	Identifies students in need of remediation or enrichment	4.155	4.000
	33	Informs students of test results	3.577	3.600
Protecting Instructional Time	34	Limits interruptions by public address announcements	3.862	4.600
	35	Ensures students are not called to office	3.776	3.000
	36	Ensures consequences for truant students	3.142	2.800
	37	Ensures tardy or truant students make up lost time	2.871	3.200
	38	Ensures learning time is used for instruction and practice	4.175	4.000
Maintaining High Visibility	39	Talks with students and teachers during breaks	4.014	4.440
	40	Visits classes to speak with students and teachers	3.861	4.600
	41	Attends co-curricular activities	3.986	3.800
	42	Cover classes for teachers	2.890	3.200
	43	Tutors or provides direct instruction for students	2.725	2.400
Providing Incentives for Teaching	44	Publicly reinforces good teaching	3.943	4.000
	45	Privately reinforces good teaching	4.091	4.600
	46	Notes superior performance in memos to personnel files	3.524	3.000
	47	Rewards special efforts with opportunities for professional development	3.787	4.000
Promoting Professional Development	48	Informs teachers of professional development activities	4.336	4.440
	49	Selects staff development activities which are consistent with school goals	4.157	4.600
	50	Demonstrates new instructional techniques	3.436	3.400
	51	Supports use of skills acquired during staff development	3.868	4.000
	52	Obtains participation of whole faculty in staff development	4.005	3.800
	53	Leads or attends staff development activities	4.050	3.600
	54	Sets times aside for faculty sharing	3.061	3.800
Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards	55	Sets high standards for student basic skills performance	4.150	4.440
	56	Sets expectations for students at different grade levels	4.092	4.440
	57	Enforces promotion standard	4.173	4.600
	58	Supports teacher enforcement of academic policies	3.908	4.800
Providing Incentives for Learning	59	Recognizes superior student performance	4.458	4.800
	60	Uses assemblies to recognize student work	4.567	4.600
	61	Sees students in office to recognize student work	3.869	4.200
	62	Contacts parents to communicate student improvement	3.784	3.800
	63	Supports teacher development of classroom rewards	3.965	3.800

Table 4

School Culture Concepts and Elementary Principals' Instructional Leader Behavior

	COLLABORATION	COMMUNITY	EXPECTATIONS	ORDER
J O N E S	*"Bounces" ideas off a group of teachers. *Committees develop school improvement plan.	*Thanks staff and individuals for good job. *Unsuccessfully sought info on school name. *At assembly, tells students book level needed for promotion.	*Established promotion policy before district did. *Reading and math progress charts in office. *Reviews teachers grade books. *Preparation for high school. *Indicates student effort needed to get education. *Encourages teachers to get advanced degrees.	*Supervises bus, lunch, and the yard. *Many parent conferences about student discipline *Initial goal a safe and clean environment. *Walks halls and checks that everything's in working order. *Visits each class every day.
T U R N E R	*Sees self as teachers' best friend, yet realizes teachers do not all agree. *Open door policy for teachers. *Talks to persuade, rather than use power.	*Outstanding teachers are heroes. *Students bring their work to principal's office.	*Much time spent on classroom supervision activities. *Writes comments on lesson plans. *Monitors instructional pacing with grade level meetings. *Developed grade level units for the curriculum. *Provides school staff development herself.	
M O O R E	*Consensus often reached in faculty meetings. *Ad hoc committees complete needed tasks. *Principal meets monthly with parents.	*Visible student recognition. *New slogan each year.	*Conveys concept that all children can learn. *Reviews lesson plans monthly. High visibility days for classroom supervision. *Analyzes own limitations to improve her performance. *Asks children, "What book are you in now?"	*Spends most of her time interacting with students and parents.

Table 4 (cont.)

	COLLABORATION	COMMUNITY	EXPECTATIONS	ORDER
W I L L I A M S	*Leadership team approach to accomplish goals. *Uses committees. *Established faculty communication system. *Two parents in school all day to provide input. *Bonding among groups, not whole school.	*New slogan each year. *Student winner of school district prize is hero.	*Devotes most time to classroom supervision. *Spends most time in meetings with teachers. *Primary goal to raise achievement. *Set up "at risk" classroom. *Aware of usage of instructural materials. *Students compete for good jobs. *Student data on reading analyzed by committee.	*Supervises students in lunchroom and school yard. *Lateness monitored by counselor.
S M I T H	*Established a leadership team. *Staff development led by teachers. *Notifies teachers in advance of formal evaluation visits. *Envisions a community of learners, adults and children. *Supports risk taking. *Shared ownership of school improvement efforts.	*Visible display of school goals. *Monthly newsletters on academic focus. *Student recognition programs. *Parent certificates. *Nominates teachers for excellence in teaching awards. *Participated in trip with paired suburban school. *Birthday party for school, buried time capsule. *School slogan, "Be The Best That You Can Be", utilized at beginning and end of each day. *Principals, past and present, are heroes. *Stories of successes of students and school improvement efforts. *Leadership team to "Sow The Seeds."	*Refers to goals during assembly programs. *Uses student achievement data to inform staff of current level. *Meets with teachers to set student achievement goals. *Reads lesson plans. *Asks students what they learned that day.	

TABLE 5 Leadership Orientations Instrument: Self Ratings of Elementary Principals

	Group		Mr. Jones		Mrs. Turner		Ms. Williams		Mrs. Moore		Dr. Smith*	
STRUCTURAL	4.18		4.25		4.00		4.63		4.38		3.63	
ANALYTIC		4.20		4.25		3.75		4.75		4.25		4.00
ORGANIZED		4.15		4.25		4.25		4.50		4.50		3.25
HUMAN RESOURCES	4.43		3.88		4.63		5.00		4.75		3.88	
SUPPORTIVE		4.40		4.00		4.75		5.00		4.50		3.75
PARTICIPATIVE		4.45		3.75		4.50		5.00		5.00		4.00
POLITICAL	4.08		3.79		3.63		4.63		4.50		3.88	
POWERFUL		4.10		3.25		4.00		4.25		5.00		4.00
ADROIT		4.07		4.33		3.25		5.00		4.00		3.75
SYMBOLIC	4.10		3.38		4.38		4.75		4.13		3.88	
INSPIRATIONAL		4.30		3.75		4.50		5.00		4.50		3.75
CHARISMATIC		3.90		3.00		4.25		4.50		3.75		4.00

* Only person not to rate any item with a 5.